

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
PINE BLUFF DIVISION**

**STEVEN ELLIS**

**PETITIONER**

**VS.**

**CASE NO. 5:10CV00214 SWW**

**RAY HOBBS, Director of the  
Arkansas Department of Correction**

**RESPONDENT**

**ORDER**

The Court has received proposed Findings and Recommendations from Magistrate Judge H. David Young. After careful review of those Findings and Recommendations, the timely objections received thereto, and a *de novo* review of the record, the Court concludes that the Findings and Recommendations should be, and hereby are, approved and adopted in their entirety as this court's findings in all respects. In an effort to explain why the Court should consider the merits of his claims, petitioner complains he was never notified of the 1-year limitations period imposed by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). *See* Docket entry 12 (Objections). Even in the case of an unrepresented prisoner, ignorance of the law is not a basis for equitable tolling. *See Cross-Bey v. Gammon*, 322 F.3d 1012, 1015 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). Judgment will be entered accordingly.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253 and Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2554 Cases in the United States District Court, the Court must determine whether to issue a certificate of appealability in the final order. In § 2254 cases, a certificate of appealability may issue only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)-(2). The Court finds no issue on which petitioner has made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right. Thus, the certificate of appealability is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2010.

/s/Susan Webber Wright

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE